

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, JULY 27, 2021**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, held a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street, with an option for attendance through Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

**1. Roll Call.**

***Council Members***

Mr. Thomas P. Gullotta, Chairman

Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman

Ms. Deborah A. Carroll {participated via video conferencing}

Mr. White Osgood

Dr. Stewart Beckett III

Ms. Mary LaChance

Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh

Mr. Jacob McChesney

Ms. Lillian Tanski

**a. Pledge of Allegiance**

***Led by Francis Carino***

**2. Public Comment.**

Mr. Gullotta explained that Francis Carino, the former Supervisory Assistant State's Attorney for Juvenile Matters, will provide some information about the juvenile crime issue and possible ways to address it on the local level.

Mr. Carino explained that he recently retired after 41 years as a general prosecutor. He was also part of the oversight committee on juvenile justice policy, which he believes was responsible for many of the changes to the system that contributed to this rise in juvenile crimes. He discussed the evolution of criminal justice in Connecticut, the age of jurisdiction, the detention of juveniles, transfer of the more serious cases to adult court, and the sentencing options in criminal court.

Though he does not have official numbers, he estimates that the judicial system is beneficial to about 90% of the children who go through it, while the remaining 10% is a hardcore group of serious criminal offenders. The age of jurisdiction was eventually raised from 16 to 18 after advocacy efforts, which argued that a 16-year-old's brain is not fully developed. However, he noted that 16-year-olds can drive and hold a job, so that argument is inconsistent. The most recent law has raised the minimum age of prosecution to 10 years old. Violation of a court order is no longer a criminal act. Therefore, there is no longer an incentive for offenders to listen to the judge. In 2017, truancy and defiance no longer ended up in juvenile court, with nothing to

replace them. If the family does not want to cooperate, then there is nothing that the Youth Service Bureau can do to obtain school records. There are no consequences if the family does not even show up. Now, police must obtain the judge's permission, in order to detain a child. The judge must now ensure that the detention meets one of three grounds which must deem that it is in the interest of the public's safety. Previously, the legislation also included grounds for "the child's safety." The only way to detain a child now is if the crime is so serious and "poses a risk to public safety" (which has a high bar), that the judge deems that the child needs to be locked up.

Transfer to the adult court is discretionary for less serious crimes. It used to be automatic. In 2015, the legislation changed the minimum age from 14 to 15. The judge has to determine that it is in the child's best interest to transfer them, which makes no sense because the child loses their rights in transfer. The sentencing options in criminal court have also changed. The one boys' facility in the state has been closed down, and they can no longer commit children to DCF. The maximum length of time has been reduced from 36 to 30 months. Theoretically, if a 14-year-old commits a heinous crime, such as mass murder, once they turn 18, they can get their record erased.

Mr. Carino also addressed the new marijuana law, noting that the police have no way of knowing a juvenile's prior record. This is important because a third offense carries a more severe consequence than a first offense. Glastonbury Police will not know whether a child was previously arrested in Hartford, and if so, how many times. Judges and police must be given access to criminal records, he concluded.

Mr. Gullotta read a card that was not read at the forum:

Q: Why isn't Glastonbury police using license plate readers?

A: Mr. Gullotta answered that the Chief of Police has not yet requested the Council to fund them. However, he has no doubt that if additional financial support is requested, the Council will accept it unanimously.

Chairman Gullotta opened the floor for in-person attendees to comment.

**Mark Branse of 48 Birch Trail**, is an attorney but is speaking as a resident tonight to urge the Council and the TPZ to pursue village districts because they address the deficiencies and gaps in the current zoning laws. He noted that, in the past, the Town had to establish two different zones on either side of Hebron Avenue. The rigidity of this process could have been avoided by the creation of a village district which contains uniformity rules throughout the zone. He also noted that village districts also pose some advantages to historical districts. For one, they do not have to be historical, nor do they require a referendum. Like historic districts, village districts also allow for the regulation of demolition (of iconic buildings), but they are more flexible because those buildings do not have to be historical. Village districts just identify a common theme.

Mr. Branse noted that village district zones can be compatible with historic districts. He cited the example of the Goodspeed Opera House in East Haddam, which overlapped with a historic

district. He also helped develop Village District zones in the villages of Higganum and Tylerville, both in Haddam, and Sound View in Old Lyme.

**Judith Stonger at 30 Woodbridge Road**, is extremely concerned about the serious escalation of crimes in town. She has increasingly become more frightened for safety. She is equally concerned about the process of working towards solutions, which must be done collaboratively using civil discourse. Many ideas were presented at last week's forum. Each must be respectfully considered, discussed, and evaluated for its merit without bias and prejudice.

**Stephen Maksymiuk of 275 Forest Lane**, is a member of Safe Streets CT. He read an email that he had sent over to the Council. He thanked the Council for holding a forum and for leading the discussion well. He stated that everyone is on the same page regarding this issue. He found it moving that other mayors and police from other towns voiced their concerns. He asked the Council to do the same by attending other towns' forums this summer. He made the following requests:

- For the Police: put more patrol miles on their cars (and not just at night); use of license plate readers; use of roadblocks at night
- For the Town: a town-sponsored government task force; real access to all crime data, with a dashboard with accurate information; provide statistics to the Glastonbury Citizen every week

**Chris Haaf at 39 Strickland Street**, is happy to hear about the license plate readers. He apologized for surly comments made towards the Council during the Forum. He was informed by his negative experiences at the BOE meetings, led by Chairman Foyle. He asked the Council to speak with Dr. Foyle on 'toning down his arrogance.'

**Marie Lorenzo of 97 Hubbard Drive**, spoke on the issue of juvenile crime. She asked if there is anything that Glastonbury can do in the short term related to ordinances, until the state takes legal action.

**Laura Hancock of 255 Weir Street**, is an administrator of the Safe Streets Glastonbury page. She suggested they work collaboratively with the Council by periodically providing them with a list of updates and suggestions, which the Council could then send out to the broader community, such as information on tracking.

Ms. Carroll read the written comment received, as listed on the Town website:

**Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive**, is concerned about the increase in car thefts and the resulting individual and collective trauma. She is equally concerned about children potentially being treated as adults, in the efforts to change the existing laws for juvenile offenders. Children's brains are still developing until the age of 25, so she does not support treating youth as adults. She is also concerned about the Affordable Housing Steering Committee meeting format being in-person only. Affordable housing is a very important issue for Glastonbury, and the availability of these meetings does not reflect that importance. She thanked all elected officials in Town for their efforts despite the challenges and disrespect they face.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for comments from Zoom attendees.

***Amanda Ostrowitz of 63 Green Tree Drive***, is a cannabis attorney. She stated that Glastonbury cannot choose whether to ban cannabis in the community because it is already here. They can simply choose whether to regulate it or not. She urged the Council to reconsider the 18-month moratorium, stating that Glastonbury would miss out on a medical dispensary.

Mr. Johnson noted that juvenile crime is an evolving issue affecting many towns, not just Glastonbury. He gave a status report, listing the following items:

1. Glastonbury has a community relations officer, Officer McGrady, who has been assigned as a Town liaison with Safe Streets and serves as a direct link to the GPD and the Town Manager.
2. GPD has established a three-member dedicated task force for crimes committed by juveniles.
3. Glastonbury is also part of a state task force dedicated to this issue, along with 11 other Greater Hartford communities.
4. The Town website continues to improve crime data. On the homepage, there is a direct link to all the data on crime statistics. They will continue to build that daily.
5. Most streetlights have cameras which read the queue at the light. The potential is to install either mobile license plate readers in police vehicles or fixed license plate readers located at access points to/from Glastonbury. They expect to have a report at the Council's August meeting.
6. They have prepared a poster on tips regarding the basics of safety, such as locking cars. They request that Safe Streets volunteers help them distribute those posters out to the public.
7. All town publications will include a notice on how to prevent vehicle theft, which will contain the link to their database.
8. A reverse 911 system (which will likely be used as a sign-up system) will provide another opportunity to get the word out.
9. There is continued emphasis on recruitment and selection of police officers. There is a dwindling number of people wanting to become officers. They are working to fill vacancies.
10. At the Forum, a comment was made regarding accreditation. Mr. Johnson noted that Glastonbury was the first police department in the state of Connecticut to be accredited, in 1986.
11. Tire deflation devices can be properly and safely deployed to slow down offenders. They have added them to all police vehicles.

Mr. Johnson concluded that this list would continue to grow in the coming weeks.

Police Chief Porter spoke to the license plate readers (LPRs). He explained that they are either mobile (meaning attached to one of their vehicles) or mounted to a pole. They cost around \$5,000-\$10,000, depending on the model. The use of LPRs will provide them with valuable data

and evidence, not only for these kinds of crimes but others, as well. However, his concern is that there is a misperception that LPRs will really help in this war of prevention. That is simply not true. He has polled about a dozen chiefs who all say the same thing. LPRs provide evidence, but there is no evidence to support that they prevent these juvenile crimes from happening.

Chief Porter then spoke to the task force, explaining that three staff members have been assigned to the unit: a supervisor and two police officers. They do a lot of proactive and reactive work and have already made some great headway, such as recovering stolen vehicles, guns, and making some arrests. The challenge is the staffing. He has had to borrow the staff members from three other units in the police department. This will be implemented on a temporary basis to see the effect. They will do the same thing with the LPRs, to gauge whether the cost benefit is there. He reiterated the Town Manager's statement that the GDP purchased a dozen more tire deflation devices. It has been a challenge, but the option is there, if the use presents itself.

Mr. Osgood asked if it is possible to show in the collective database every time a juvenile has been stopped. Chief Porter replied, no. They have a system in place for adults, but there is no computer system in place that will allow for sharing of juvenile data. He thinks that it would be easier for the agencies collaborating in the task force to get information from each other on juvenile statistics. He noted that, with arrests, there is nothing preventing them from sharing that data with other agencies. What Mr. Carino talked about is court and probation data, which the police do not have access to. Mr. Niland asked if they have run into any overtime compensation issues with the task force. Chief Porter stated that he and the Town Manager discussed overtime and staffing needs. They are in good shape compared to other towns, but he is keeping an eye on it.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked how the taskforce is going about suppressing crime, rather than just recovery and arrest. Chief Porter stated that they are doing a variety of things. The taskforce has been proactive, going into the community, and handing out posters. They are also investigating crimes specifically and working with other task forces, mainly in cities, who are knowledgeable about who the players are. The task force is going to the cities instead of them coming to Glastonbury. Mr. Cavanaugh asked, if the LPRs detect a stolen vehicle, would that still be considered a larceny. Chief Porter replied yes, it is a property crime, and all the restrictions still exist. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there is a minimum mileage for patrol. The Chief replied no, because being omnipresent does not deter these criminals, and because the town has lots of road miles and criminal activity is spread out, so extra patrolling would not be the best use of their dollars.

---

## **JOINT PRELIMINARY PUBLIC HEARING – 8:00 P.M.**

### **NO 1: APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF ZONE FROM RURAL RESIDENCE TO PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – WINTERGREEN GLEN PHASE III – 4 SINGLE FAMILY HOMES ON 9.853± ACRES.**

Attorney Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC represented Rejean Jacques, the developer of the project. She explained that the proposal is Phase 3 of the Wintergreen Glen PAD. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to receive initial input from the public, the TPZ, and the Council. They have sent notices to abutters within 500 feet of the property. She listed the site features: Roaring Brook and Wintergreen Brook run through the area. She reviewed the unique history of the PAD. In 1991, the Council approved a change of zone from the Rural Residence to the Planned Area Development. It involved 14 lots on 26.9 acres. The developer proposed two future areas of development. After receiving Council approval, it was sent to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission. In 1998, a second joint preliminary meeting was held. The dam was in disrepair. They decided to proceed with only one of the two parcels. Phase 2 was approved in 2002 with a lot of conservation easements around the area. In 2016, a portion of the lot that is now associated with her client was deemed to the Kongsicut Land Trust.

Jon Sczurek, P.E. of Megson, Heagle & Friend, LLC explained the site details, noting that the access is through Staples Lane out through Manchester Road. There is an existing driveway which serves as two lots, totaling 1800 linear feet. They propose increasing the driveway to a 20-foot-wide common drive. An additional length would service lot 19, meaning that the driveway would reach a maximum of 2130 feet. Four new lots are proposed, along with the two existing, and the one lot that was approved under phase 1. He noted that the 100-year flood event when the dam was in place would have resulted in about 6 inches of water over the driveway surface. Now that the dam has washed out, the flood elevation has changed. They are hopeful that their dam study will show that the driveway would not be under the 100-year flood event now.

Mr. Sczurek reviewed the site lines on Manchester Road. The current speed data and traffic count data from the DOT show that the 85th percentile speed indicated that traffic was 24.8 miles per hour. The posted speed limit is 30 miles per hour, so it is within range. The site distance would be about 280 feet. The original plans showed some vegetation to be cleared north of the driveway. They will ensure compliance with all the site line requirements. On the easterly portion of the site, the driveway would continue where it left off on the last site. The proposal would be to develop four new homes on 9.1 acres of buildable land. He calculated that number by subtracting the area of the wetlands + flood zone + the areas of slopes greater than 25%. There will be onsite wells and septic systems on all the lots. They did confirmatory test pits on all lots in December 2020.

Attorney Hope stated that, as part of the original PAD approval, the developer drafted a set of restrictions on the house. They propose to have those conditions as a major amendment to a PAD. She listed all the meetings the applicant will need to go through as part of the administrative process.

She has also received a few calls from neighbors: Larry Garfinkel lives in the phase 1 section of the Wintergreen Glen PAD. He is concerned about the connection of the loop from Forest Lane to Manchester Road. Attorney Hope explained that they do not propose to make that connection because the Fire Marshal did not indicate that they wanted that. Instead, they propose the connection from Staples Lane to Manchester Road. Mr. Garfinkel's second question was how the association would work between the east and west sides of the PAD. Attorney Hope explained

that it would make sense to separate the maintenance, with snow plowing separate from how the HOA deals with it on the other portion of the PAD.

Chairman Gullotta opened the floor for comments from the public.

**James Wagner of 40 Staples Lane**, stated that the traffic data is not reflective of reality when pulling out of Staples Lane. People do not stay in their lane when they make that sharp turn. If the developer plans on widening Staples Lane to 20 feet, how will he get into his house? The only access right now from his house is through Staples Lane, and there is no maintenance there right now. He also thought that this was approved for two additional lots, not four.

**William Borden of 80 Staples Lane**, expressed concerns about this being very close to his home. The additional traffic coming out of Staples Lane is a difficult maneuver. He asked if this zoning change includes the existing homes on the road. The topography of the north side of his property, as it abuts the road, is an extremely downward slope. He asked what will be done to abate the runoff from the hillside. Is there any cross-sectional analysis on the road and how it abuts the existing property? He also asked what the plot plan looks like in comparison to the original plot plan.

**John Petrik of 105 Eastbury Hill Road**, asked if any decision has been made on the square footage of these houses. He also asked where the septic systems will be located and if the southern property line be surveyed. He asked to verify the 50-foot setback.

**Jennifer Googins of 74 Forest Lane** (via Zoom), stated that the current layout of the homes seems reasonably far apart, but conditions do change. She is concerned that the houses and their associated well and/or septic systems will come very close to the conservation easements associated with the north part of the property, which abuts her property. They live in a very rural area, and she wants to keep it that way. She would like to understand how much latitude or leeway the developer has to move things around.

Attorney Hope addressed the various comments made. She explained that they have not yet conducted a traffic study, but they have to seek approval from the DOT for anything that happens in the right of way. Their zone change does not include the existing homes on Staples Lane, just 120 Staples Lane. The square footage of the footprint of the home was limited to 3200 square feet. They surveyed the property lines as part of the approval regarding verifying the setbacks. The houses have to stay where they are. If there is a change, they would have to return to the Council.

Mr. Sczurek answered the engineering questions. He explained that they conducted an administrative review of the driveway grading. They discussed with the Town Environmental Planner that it was going to be required as part of the wetlands review. All that work requires a wetlands permit. An administrative review provides not only cross sections but also a plan and profile view of the grade of the driveway. There will be a cut on the uphill side. They have the grading on their plan, but all that grading occurred before they reach the neighbors' property lines. As far as drainage concepts, the proposal is to sheet the water directly across the driveway

and allow natural drainage to happen. They will install a stone swale along the driveway to prevent the water from getting back to the wetlands area.

Regarding the driveway sight lines, Mr. Sczurek explained that they would be required to obtain a DOT permit for construction of a large driveway access to Manchester Road. As far as the construction, they will be widening the road, and plans would have to show how that pavement would match to existing (neighbors') roadway. There will be short periods of time where they will have to work in the neighbors' driveway to make that connection. They will also remove the old culvert and replace it with a new one. He stated that the wells and septics would be on lots 19 and 20. Mr. Sczurek explained that the first iteration of the plan had 8 lots. From there on, it was lowered to 4 lots. He never saw any 2-lot proposal.

Dr. Beckett asked why this is a PAD instead of just a subdivision. Ms. Hope explained that they are continuing with the PAD. They cannot subdivide this property as it is because it is too far back from Manchester Road. Dr. Beckett stated that it would be a mistake not to connect Lazy Valley Road, so that people could have emergency access. Mr. Osgood agreed. Mr. Cavanaugh asked why the Fire Marshal said no to this suggestion. Mr. Sczurek clarified that he did not say no. He simply is not going to require it. Mr. Zanolungo, Chairman of the TPZ, asked about a time frame for this project. Ms. Hope stated that it will likely take about one month per meeting, so a total of 9 or 10 months to obtain all the permitting approvals. From there, the road would be the first phase. Mr. Zanolungo stated that the TPZ would also want a traffic study.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if Staples Lane is a private road. Ms. Hope replied yes, her client, Mr. Jacques owns it. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if all this land was purchased at the same time. Ms. Hope said no, but phase 2 and phase 3 were purchased at the same time, around 1995. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the applicant has ever owned the dam. Ms. Hope stated yes, it was sold in 2016. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that he watched the dam deteriorate over the years, and he thinks that it was due to a lack of maintenance from the applicant. Mr. Botelho, Secretary of the TPZ, asked how long the common drive is. Mr. Sczurek stated that, to the end of the cul de sac was 1800 feet and to the farthest lot was 2130 feet. Mr. Botelho asked if all the other lots in phases 1 and 2 were septic. Ms. Hope replied yes.

Mr. Osgood asked if they have a timeline on approvals and time to develop. Ms. Hope explained that there wasn't one put on phase 1 or phase 2, but it is part of the Town's PAD regulations. The Council can put timelines on it. Ms. Tanski asked what restrictions existed that were specific to the original PAD. Ms. Hope noted that the original approval proposed to take all the covenants and restrictions into the PAD regulations. However, there was pushback from staff, so they extracted certain portions of it and attached that to the original approval. Most of it spoke to the design details because that was something that the zoning official could enforce. Ms. Hope reiterated that, should the Council have specific issues with any covenants or restrictions, they could change it, since they were the body who initially enforced it. Mr. Niland noted that there have been issues with uranium in town. He asked if the applicant has done any testing. Ms. Hope said not yet, and there is no way to test it now, but they can look at data from the neighbors.

Attorney Hope concluded by stating that if the public has questions, they can forward them to the Office of Community Development, and they will try to address them.



---

**PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION ON PUBLIC HEARING - 8:00 P.M.**

**NO 1: PROPOSED TOWN ACQUISITION OF THE 10± ACRE WELLES STREET PROPERTY AND A \$1,750,000 APPROPRIATION PER THE RESERVE FOR LAND ACQUISITION.**

Mr. Johnson explained that this is a proposal for the Town to purchase the area across from the Riverfront Community Center and Riverfront Park. They are going through due diligence. Residential use is not permitted for five years, but after that, there could be no limits on the use of the building. There is a 10-year parking agreement for the lot behind the church, with the potential to renew every 10 years for up to 50 years maximum. Maintenance of the lots is shared equally with the church.

Mr. Johnson suggested the Council continue the public hearing to September 14. The Council agreed to do so by consensus.

**NO 2: PROPOSED TOWN ACQUISITION OF THE 1.18 ACRE GOODALE-RAMAKER POST #56 PROPERTY AND A \$195,000 APPROPRIATION AND TRANSFER.**

Mr. Johnson explained that this is a proposal for the Town to purchase the American Legion facility. Located between Main Street and Earle Park, it serves as a primary access point for the park. The American Legion meets monthly, which they would continue to do for three years. They also have a private museum which they would continue to use during that period. After that, it would be subject to Council approval on a year-by-year basis.

He had previously mentioned funding this through the General Fund. However, the BOF raised concerns about that. Their recommendation was to use the Land Acquisition and Preservation Fund. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the Council needs to follow the BOF's recommendation, which is to pay for this using the bonding authorization, not cash. Mr. Johnson replied, absent a favorable funding report, yes, the Council does have to follow their recommendation.

*Joseph Muro of 151 Liberty Drive*, supports this purchase which will give the Town access to Earle Park for the future. He suggested the Town pave the parking lot and create an extra lot so that they could accommodate the overflow use in the fall from the cider mill. He stated that, when the three years are up, they should build something similar to the Audubon Society, so that children could learn about nature.

Mr. Johnson suggested the Council continue the public hearing to September 14. The Council agreed to do so by consensus.

---

**3. Special Reports.                      None**

4. **Old Business.** *None*

5. **New Business.** *None*

- a. **Discussion and possible action concerning Public Act 21-1 – Responsible and Equitable Regulation of Adult-Use Cannabis Act (Cannabis Act) (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission proposed amendment to the Building Zone Regulations adding Section 3.27 to establish a moratorium per Public Act 21-1 (June 2021 Special Session) entitled “Responsible and Equitable Regulation of Adult-Use Cannabis Act (Cannabis Act)” and schedules a special meeting and public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Wednesday, August 11, 2021, to consider the proposed amendment, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 23, 2021.*

**Disc:** Mr. Johnson explained that the Public Act 21-1 provides for various establishments that are permitted for town zoning regulations. Because there are regulations to be promulgated and more legislation may come forward on this matter in 2022, the thought was to establish a moratorium. A moratorium is a time-out for 18 months to have a deliberate, thoughtful view of the regulations. Glastonbury can then decide how their regulations are going to be amended for these types of establishments. He noted that some other communities have already enacted this. The reason for the special meeting is that any amendment is effective 15 days after publication., and the thought was to do it sooner rather than later.

Mr. Osgood does not see a reason for a special meeting. The purpose of a moratorium is to review ordinances. He supports a moratorium of 6 months, but 18 months seems excessive. Ms. Tanski supports a moratorium because it would be in keeping with how Glastonbury typically handles zoning. She finds 18 months to be reasonable and noted that the moratorium does not disallow the Council from taking action earlier, such as in 6 months. She would like adequate time to review the regulations and what will come out of the next legislative session.

Mr. Niland agreed, stating that a special meeting makes sense because the discussion will be lengthy. He also agrees with the 18-month time frame. Ms. Carroll also prefers a special meeting because she worries that this could get lost in the scope of a regular council meeting. She finds 18 months to be appropriate but stated that the Council can dial it back if they need to. Ms. LaChance does not support pushing this off to September because that will be a very busy meeting. This is something that the Council should go through thoughtfully. Mr. Gullotta also agreed that a mid-August meeting makes sense. Mr. McChesney is in favor of an August meeting. Having previously served on the TPZ, he noted that it can take a long time to review these regulations.

Dr. Beckett suggested cancelling their next regular meeting and conducting that business on the special meeting date.

**Motion by:** Dr. Beckett

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby cancels their August 3, 2021 Regular Meeting and moves that agenda to the August 11, 2021 Special Meeting.

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

**Result:** Original motion was passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

**b. Discussion and possible action concerning proposed new Village District Zones.**

Mr. Johnson explained that this is a change to the building zone regulations, which the Council can amend for a village district. He believes that the first step would be to refer a proposed amendment to the TPZ, who would have 35 days to get back to the Council with a report and recommendation. After that, a proposed amendment/regulation would be subject to Council public hearing and action.

Mr. Cavanaugh expressed that he believed that the Council could do this with a simple referral to the TPZ, which he thinks has been satisfied. Mr. Johnson stated that a regulation has not been drafted. Statute 8-2J describes what a village district is. He asked, what is the Council's specific amendment to the building zone regulations? Chairman Gullotta agreed with Mr. Cavanaugh. The TPZ considered it, but they decided to send it back to them. He asked the Town Manager to develop a regulation with the Town Attorney.

Mr. Osgood clarified that the Council asked the TPZ for a comment on the concept, and they agreed to form a joint group with the Council to discuss this matter and take it to public hearing. Changing building zone ordinances is a time-consuming process, which needs to be done deliberately. He assumes that it would take at least 9-10 months. Ms. Tanski agreed, stating that they need to take a careful approach to all questions around planning and development. A joint TPZ/Council commission should be the first step. They should also proceed with caution here. Attorney Branse looked upon the establishment of a village district, as opposed to a historic district, as a positive because it would not require a public hearing and public commission. Ms. Tanski views that as a negative. She is also not convinced that a village district applies to the area that they are talking about. Design guidelines would be more appropriate there.

Dr. Beckett noted that the state statute is quite general, so they need to do their due diligence. At this point, they do not know the specifics for Glastonbury. Mr. Niland also does not want to ram through anything without public comments and hearings. He is interested in having an ordinance in front of him before going to a public hearing. Mr. McChesney is also uncomfortable because they do not have an ordinance. He understands the desire to move forward, but from his perspective as an attorney, what they choose to do needs to hold up.

Mr. Niland is in favor of village districts because they are important to protect the charm and character of a New England downtown. People constantly talk about how this town is changing, and their residents want them to do something about it soon. Mr. Osgood asked for an update on hiring someone to do the design standards. Mr. Johnson stated that it is in process. They will hold interviews in early-to-mid-September. The Council could appoint a designee to the selection committee.

Ms. Carroll wholeheartedly supports the village districts concept. She also thinks that it is important to follow the protocols. Village district and design guidelines are two separate processes. She asked if the ordinance will be drafted by the TPZ or to the Town Attorney. Mr. Johnson explained that they can draft a proposed amendment to the building zone regulations to establish a village district. Until that time, there isn't anything for the TPZ to consider or for the Council to hold a public hearing on. A regulation should be drafted and forwarded to the TPZ; then, the Council would schedule a public hearing, with notice to the affected property owners.

***Motion by:*** Ms. Carroll

***Seconded by:*** Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby requests that the Town Manager, in conjunction with the Town Attorney, develops a proposed amendment to the building zone regulations to establish a village district along Main Street between the intersection with Naubuc Avenue and New London Turnpike and Rankin Road; from Salmon Brook south to Rankin Road; from Main Street east to Route 2; and from Rankin Road to School Street.

***Disc:*** Ms. Tanski will vote against this motion. She believes that the best way to go about this is to take a more extensive review of their regulations. At best, she sees this action as a stopgap measure which does not take a totality review of their existing regulations. At worst, she sees it as an impediment to having a unified sense of development of the Town Center going forward. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that that is why he is proposing this: to freeze everything in time. He listed a few examples of buildings which could be preserved with the creation of a village district. He does not want to redesign what they have but to preserve what they have. Now is the time to act.

Ms. LaChance echoed Mr. Cavanaugh, stating that this allows them to take a pause to have a review. They may potentially lose some historic buildings in town while going through the

review process. Mr. McChesney stated that if they have issues with the scope of the regulations, they can always change it when they see the regulations before them. He disputes the statement that a village district is not applicable here, arguing that the area has distinctive character, landscape, and historic value.

**Call to Question by:** Dr. Beckett

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

**Result:** Passed {6-3-0}, with Mr. Osgood, Mr. Cavanaugh, and Ms. Tanski voting against.

Ms. Carroll read the motion again.

**Result:** Motion passed {7-2-0} with Mr. Osgood and Ms. Tanski voting against.

**c. Action to extend Collective Bargaining Agreement July 1, 2021- June 30, 2024.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the funds necessary to implement the three-year extension to the written Agreement between the Town of Glastonbury and Highway, Vehicle Maintenance, and Refuse Group (IUOE) effective July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2024, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 23, 2021.*

**Disc:** Mr. Johnson explained that this is an agreement with IUOE for a combination of wage adjustments and a cumulative 0.75% increase in the employee contribution to the legacy pension plan, effective over three years. It is commensurate with their general wage adjustment. Mr. Osgood asked how this compares to other negotiations they have recently agreed to. Mr. Johnson explained that the 2% is consistent with other groups they have agreed to. There are no agreements in place for July 2022 or 2023 at this point.

**Result:** Motion was passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

**6. Consent Calendar. None**

**7. Town Manager's Report.**

Ms. Tanski asked when the draft for the park signage will be ready. She requested that the signs be clearly visible. Mr. Johnson explained that they are currently working on the logo design. Their intention was to have something to add to the signs that are already in the parks. He will try to have it ready to present at the Council's next meeting. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the new cameras in the Council Chambers include a new speaker system. Mr. Johnson stated that he does not believe that there is a sound system here because the audio generally works fine.

Ms. Tanski proposed an item for the Council’s next meeting. She would like to enact a Council resolution on the issue of juvenile crimes. Dr. Beckett suggested they have the resolution ready to present at the next meeting. The Council agreed to have Mr. Johnson draft a resolution which incorporates much of the language that Ms. Tanski suggested, which was the following:

“I would request that we add a discussion on a formal resolution from this Council on the juvenile crime issues, outlining the actions that our town has taken and is taking, recognizing a shared responsibility between citizens, town government, and our state government, for addressing this issue. Reiterating the same calls to our state legislature to act, that we have on our Town website as talking points and confirming support and resources for any as seen needed and fit by our Glastonbury Police Department.”

The Council unanimously agreed to add the item to their next meeting agenda.

- 8. Committee Reports.**
  - a. Chairman’s Report.** *None*
  - b. MDC.** *None*
  - c. CRCOG.** *None*

**9. Communications.** *None*

- 10. Minutes.**
  - a. Minutes of July 13, 2021 Regular Meeting.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll *Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

*Result:* Minutes were accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

**11. Appointments and Resignations.** *None*

- 12. Executive Session.**
  - a. Draft Terms and Conditions – Sale of Town-owned land – Eastern Boulevard.**

*Motion by:* Mr. Niland *Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into executive session to discuss draft terms and conditions of the sale of Town-owned land at 10:40 P.M.*

*Result:* Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

*Present for the Executive Session item were council members, Mr. Tom Gullotta, Chairman, Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman, Dr. Beckett, Ms. Deb Carroll, Ms. Mary LaChance, Mr. Jake McChesney, Ms. Lillian Tanski, Mr. Whit Osgood, and Mr. Kurt Cavanaugh, with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson.*

No votes were taken during the Executive Session, which ended at 10:45 P.M.

*Following the Executive Session, The Council discussed, in private, collective bargaining negotiations and such discussions are not treated as a meeting under the applicable sections of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Attendees for the private session included the Town Council members and the Town Manager.*

No votes were taken following the Executive Session. Meeting adjourned at 10:46 P.M.

Following the Executive Session and Meeting Adjournment, the Council, with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, entered a non-meeting format discussion. They came out of the non-meeting format discussion at 11:00 P.M.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta**

**Chairman**